		01 TO 4,000 FT		/ **********************************	,					
KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3 (C-12 O	C-48	PATH	EQPT	TOTAL	
							COST	COST	COST	
547 CI	HANDLER	9	3	0	0	0	44,500	74,124	118,624	
548 CI	HANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,968	
549 CI	HANDLER	11	0	0	0	0	44,500	24,204	68,704	
550 CI	HANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,968	
551 CI	HANDLER	2	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,968	
552 C	HANDLER	2	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,968	
553 C	HANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,968	
554 C	HANDLER	3	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,968	
555 C	HANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,968	
556 C	HANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,96	
557 C	HANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,96	
558 C	HANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,96	
559 C	HANDLER	3	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,96	
560 S	ACATON	1	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,96	
561 E	LOY	2	0	0	0	0	44,500	5,468	49,96	
				Sub-	Γotals		\$24,964,500	\$5,703,867		
	#	in this Study	3101				Sum of	Total Cost	\$30,668,36	
	1	# in this Band	561			Average of Total Cost \$54,6				
						% of Addresses in this Band 18.09				

1 SCOTTSDALE 2 PHOENIX 3 SCOTTSDALE 4 PHOENIX 5 PHOENIX 6 PHOENIX 7 PHOENIX 8 PHOENIX 9 PHOENIX 10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX 12 PHOENIX 13 PHOENIX	1 1 1 8 3 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		63,000 63,000 63,000 63,000 63,000 63,000 63,000	5,468 5,468 5,468 5,468 16,136 5,468 5,468	68,468 68,468 68,468 79,136 68,468 68,468
2 PHOENIX 3 SCOTTSDALE 4 PHOENIX 5 PHOENIX 6 PHOENIX 7 PHOENIX 8 PHOENIX 9 PHOENIX 10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX	8 3 1 1	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	63,000 63,000 63,000 63,000 63,000	5,468 5,468 5,468 16,136 5,468 5,468	
3 SCOTTSDALE 4 PHOENIX 5 PHOENIX 6 PHOENIX 7 PHOENIX 8 PHOENIX 9 PHOENIX 10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX 12 PHOENIX	8 3 1 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	63,000 63,000 63,000 63,000	5,468 5,468 16,136 5,468 5,468	68,468 68,468 68,468 79,136 68,468 68,468
4 PHOENIX 5 PHOENIX 6 PHOENIX 7 PHOENIX 8 PHOENIX 9 PHOENIX 10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX	8 3 1 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	63,000 63,000 63,000	5,468 16,136 5,468 5,468	68,468 68,468 79,136 68,468 68,468
5 PHOENIX 6 PHOENIX 7 PHOENIX 8 PHOENIX 9 PHOENIX 10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX 12 PHOENIX	8 3 1 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0	63,000 63,000 63,000	16,136 5,468 5,468	68,468 79,136 68,468 68,468
6 PHOENIX 7 PHOENIX 8 PHOENIX 9 PHOENIX 10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX 12 PHOENIX	3 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0	63,000 63,000	16,136 5,468 5,468	79,136 68,468 68,468
7 PHOENIX 8 PHOENIX 9 PHOENIX 10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX 12 PHOENIX	1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0	0	63,000	5,468 5,468	68,468 68,468
8 PHOENIX 9 PHOENIX 10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX 12 PHOENIX	1 1 1 1 1 8	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0		and the second s		68,468 68,468
9 PHOENIX 10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX 12 PHOENIX	1 1 1 1 8 1	0 0 0	0	0	0	63,000		
10 PHOENIX 11 PHOENIX 12 PHOENIX	1 1 1 1 8 1	0	0					∪∪. → 00
11 PHOENIX 12 PHOENIX	1 1 1 8	0		^	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
12 PHOENIX	1 1 8		0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	8	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
13 PHOENIX	8		0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	1	1	0	0	0	63,000	45,996	108,996
14 PHOENIX	•	0	0	0	Ŏ.	63,000	5,468	68,468
15 PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
16 PHOENIX	7	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,136
17 PHOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
18 PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
19 PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
20 PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
21 PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
22 CAVE CREEK	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
23 PEORIA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
24 GLENDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
25 PEORIA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
26 GLENDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
27 SCOTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
28 GLENDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
29 SCOTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
30 GLENDALE	1	o			0	63,000	5,468	68,468
31 PEORIA	<u>-</u>	0	0	0	0	63,000	the second control of the control of	
32 GLENDALE	3	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,468
33 PHOENIX	4			0	0	was a second of the second	5,468	68,468
34 GLENDALE		. 0	0		0	63,000	8,068	71,068
35 GLENDALE	1.	0.	0.	0		63,000	5,468	68,468
36 GLENDALE	! 4	0	0.	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
37 PEORIA	. ا ع	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
the state of the s	3	0	0.	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
38 SCOTTSDA	1	0	0	0	0_	63,000	5,468	68,468
39 SCOTTSDALE		0	. 0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
40 SCOTTSDALE 41 SCOTTSDA	1	0	0 0	0 0	0	63,000 63,000	5,468 5,468	68,468 68,468

KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3	OC-12 O	C-48	PATH	EQPT	TOTAL
						-	COST	COST	COST
	COTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	o o	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	OENIX	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HÖENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
-	COTTSDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	IOENIX	6	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,13
	COTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDALE	8	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,13
	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
52 SC	COTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
53 PF	OENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
54 PH	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
55 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
57 PH	OENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
58 PH	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
59 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
60 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	OENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	2	0	Ó	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
63 SC	COTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0 _	63,000	5,468	68,46
64 PH	HOENIX	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
65 PH	IOENIX	39	0	0	0	0	63,000	47,794	110,79
66 PH	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	o -	63,000	5,468	68,46
67 SC	COTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
68 SC	COTTSDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
69 PH	IOENIX	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
70 SC	COTTSDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
71 SC	COTTSDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
73 SC	COTTSDALE	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
74 SC	COTTSDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDALE	4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
	ORIA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	OTTSDALE	3	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDALE	. 3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDALE	. 1	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX		0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDALE	1.	. 0	-	0	-0.	63,000	5,468	68,46
,	COTTSDALE	1.	0	. 0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46

KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3 (OC-12 O	C-48	PATH COST	EQPT COST	TOTAL COST
83 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	COTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
85 SC	COTTSDALE	3	0	0	0	0 -	63,000	5,468	68,46
86 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
87 SC	COTTSDALE	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5.468	68,46
88 SC	COTTSDALE	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
89 SC	COTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
90 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
91 PH	HEONIX	. 7	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,13
92 S0	COTTSDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
93 SC	COTTSDALE	6		0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,13
	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
95 SC	COTTSDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDALE	1	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
97 S	COTTSDALE	3	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
98 PH	HOENIX	1	ō	0	o ·	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	Ō	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	. 0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	. 0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	LENDALE	1	0		0	. 0	63,000	5,468	68,46
and the second second	LENDALE	2	0		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0	63,000	CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF THE	
	HOENIX	10	_ 0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468 24,204	68,46
	HOENIX	10	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	87,20
108 PE		' . '. 1	0			0	63,000	and a company of the first time of the company of t	68,46
109 PE			0	. 0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	· · ·	0	. 0.	0	0	the second second second second	5,468	68,46
	JN CITY		0		0		63,000	8,068	71,06
	HOENIX	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	·····	0	0	. 0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
and the second second	COTTSDALE	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
· · · ·	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	3			0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	LENDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	JN CITY	1.	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
and the second second	HOENIX	1	0	. 0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	38	2	. 0	0	0	63,000	74,873	137,87
	JN CITY	. 2	. 0	. 0.	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	JN CITY	2	0	0	0_	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	4	0	. 0.	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
	HOENIX	1	0	. 0	0	0_	63,000	5,468	68,46
123 PH	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46

KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3	OC-12 O	C-48	PATH	EQPT	TOTAL
			•				COST	COST	COST
124 PHO	ENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	TTSDALE	4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,068
	TTSDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
127 PHO		2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
128 PHO	ENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
129 PHO	ENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
130 PHO	ENIX	2 2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
131 GLEI	NDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
132 PHO	ENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
133 PHO	ENIX	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
134 PHO	ENIX	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
135 SCO	TTSDALE	4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,068
136 PHO	ENIX	1	. 0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
137 GLEI	NDALE	1	0	and the second	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
138 GLE	NDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
139 SCO	TTSDALE	0	1	0	o ·	0	63,000	44,520	107,520
	TTSDALE	1	. 4	0	0	0	63,000	60,150	123,150
141 PHO		1	. 0	. 0	o ·	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
142 PHO		14	. 0		o ·	0	63,000	23,192	86,192
143 PHO		11	. 0	0	0	0	63,000	24,204	87,204
144 GLE		2	0	0	o ·	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
145 GLEI		2	. 0	0	o o	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
146 GLE		1	0	. 0	0		63,000	5,468	68,468
147 GLE		· · · · · · · ·	. 0		0	0	63,000	5,468	
148 PHO		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	and the second of the second	68,468
149 PHO		2	0	. 0	0	0	mer and a second contract of	5,468	68,468
150 PHO		1		. 0			63,000	5,468	68,468
151 GLE			0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
152 PHO			0	0 .	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
153 PHO		1	0	. 0.	0,	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
			_ 0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	TTSDALE	3	0	0 0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	TTSDALE		0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	TTSDALE	1	. 0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
157 SCO		3	. 0	. 0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
158 PEO		, 3	. 0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	ADISE LLEY	1	. 0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	ADISE VALLEY		. 0	. 0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
161 PHO		. 2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
162 PEO		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
163 GLE		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
164 GLEI	NDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468

KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3	OC-12 O	C-48	PATH COST	EQPT COST	TOTAL COST
	GLENDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
166	PHOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	GLENDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
168	PHOENIX	1	0	0	Ö	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	GLENDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
171	PARADISE VALL	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
172	PHOENIX	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
173	PHOENIX	3 2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
174	GLENDALE	9	1	0	o o	0	63,000	46,734	109,734
175	SCOTTSDALE	9	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,136
	PHOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
177	GLENDALE	6	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,136
178	SCOTTSDALE	1	0	0	. 0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
179	GLENDALE	4	0	0	0	o ·	63,000	8,068	71,068
180	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
181	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
182	PHOENIX	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
183	GLENDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
184	GLENDALE	1	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
185	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
186	PHOENIX	3	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
187	PHOENIX	1	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
188	QUEEN CREEK	1	0	Ō	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX	2	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	GLENDALE	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX	4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,068
	GLENDALE	1	<u>0</u> .	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX	· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	GLENDALE	<u></u> 1	O		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	SCOTTSDALE	··· :	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH
	PHOENIX	1	·· - ŏ.	0	. 0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0	0	0		63,000	and the second of the second	68,468
	PHOENIX	2	- 0	0	0	0.0	the second second second second	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX	. 2.					63,000	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX	. 1	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,136
	PHOENIX	. 1,	0	. 0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX			0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX		0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	PHOENIX	2	0	0	0.	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	SCOTTSDALE	1	0	0	0 0	0	63,000 63,000	5,468 5,468	68,4 6 8 68,4 6 8

KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3	OC-12 O	C-48	PATH COST	EQPT COST	TOTAL COST
	IOENIX	1	0	0	. 0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDALE	10	0	0	0	0 0	63,000	24,204	87,20
	COTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	LENDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
214 GI	LENDALE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	5	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,13
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
217 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
218 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
219 PH	HOENIX	4	0	. 0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
220 PH	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
221 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
222 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
223 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
224 PH	HOENIX	10	0	0	0	0	63,000	24,204	87,20
225 PH	HOENIX	1	. 0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
226 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
227 PH	HOENIX	1	0			0	63,000	5,468	68,46
228 PH	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
229 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0		63,000	5,468	68,46
230 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
231 PH	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
232 PH	HOENIX	4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
233 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	. 0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	· 0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX		0	0	. , , , , ,	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	2	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	COTTSDALE	3	0			0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	
	COTTSDALE	5	0	- 0	. 0				68,46
241 MI	4 4	1	0			.0	63,000	16,136	79,13
	HOENIX			0	. 0	0_	63,000	5,468 5,468	68,46
		.].	0	0	_ 0	0.	63,000	5,468	68,46
	/ONDALE]	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	. 2	0	. 0	. 0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
246 PF	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46

KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3 C	C-12 O	C-48	PATH	EQPT	TOTAL
							COST	COST	COST
247 PH		3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
248 PH		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
250 PH		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
251 PH	IOENIX	1	0	0	Ö	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
253 PH	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
256 PH	IOENIX	2	0	0	o ·	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
257 PH	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
258 PH	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
259 PH	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
260 PH	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
261 ME	SA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
262 ME	SA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
263 PH	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
264 PH	OENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
265 PH	IOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
266 ME	SA	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
267 CH	IANDLER	2	0	0	0		63,000	5,468	68,46
268 CH	ANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
269 ME	ESA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
270 CH	IANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
271 ME	SA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
272 TE	MPE	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
273 ME	ESA	3		0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
274 ME		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	OTTSDALE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	LLESON	··· <u>i</u>	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	LLESON	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
278 ME	THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF T	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
279 ME	The second contract of the second	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
280 GI	147	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	IANDLER		0	0	0	0			and the second second
	ANDLER	. 2	. 0	0	0	0	63,000 63,000	5,468	68,46
	IANDLER	4	0	0	0	. 0		5,468	68,46
	IANDLER	2	. 0	0			63,000	5,468	68,46
	LLESON	. 2			0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HANDLER	. J	. 0	0	0_	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
287 ME			0	0	0	0	63,000 63,000	5,468 5,468	68,46 68,46

KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3	OC-12 C	OC-48	PATH COST	EQPT COST	TOTAL COST
288 MI	ESA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
289 TO	DLLESON	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
290 PH	HOENIX	8	0	0	0	o o	63,000	16,136	79,136
291 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
292 PH	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
293 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
294 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
295 PH	HOENIX	5	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,13
296 PH	HOENIX	3	0	0	0	o o	63,000	5,468	68,46
297 Pł	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	o .	63,000	5,468	68,46
298 M	ESA	1	0	0	0	o .	63,000	5,468	68,46
299 M	ESA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
300 PH	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
301 HI	GLEY	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
302 M	ESA	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
303 M	ESA	7	1	0	0	0	63,000	45,996	108,99
304 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
305 M	ËSA	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
306 PI	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
307 M	ESA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
308 CI	HANDLER	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
309 PI	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
310 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
311 Pi	HOENIX	1	0	0	. 0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
312 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
313 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
314 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
315 M	ESA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
316 M	ESA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
317 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
318 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
319 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
320 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
321 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
322 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
323 PI	HOENIX	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
324 PI	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	o	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	0	0	0	o o	63,000	5,468	68,46
	HOENIX	1	o o	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46

KEY	CITY	D\$1	DS3	OC-3	OC-12	OC-48	PATH COST	EQPT COST	TOTAL COST
	PHOENIX	5	0	0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,13
	PHOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	0	0	1	0	0	63,000	41,820	104,82
	PHOENIX	171	19	0	0	0	63,000	213,345	276,34
336 F	PHOENIX	22	0	0	0	0	63,000	24,602	87,60
337 F	PHOENIX	0	0	0	0	1	63,000	62,021	125,02
	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
340 F	PHOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
342 F	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
343 i	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
344 1	MESA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
345	TEMPE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
346	TEMPE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
347	TEMPE	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
348	TEMPE	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
349 1	PHOENIX	1	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
350 1	PHOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
351	TEMPE	3	0	0	. 0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
352	PHOENIX	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
353 1	PHOENIX	1	0	0		0 .	63,000	5,468	68,46
354 1	PHOENIX	2	0	. 0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
355 1	MESA	2	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
356 (PHOENIX	2	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
357 1	PHOENIX	1	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	1	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
359 1	MESA	1	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
360 1	MESA	1	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	1	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
362 (PHOENIX	1	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	MESA	1	0	0		ŏ	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	2	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	GLENDALE	1	0	0		o o	63,000	5,468	68,46
	MESA	2	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	TOLLESON	1	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	PHOENIX	2	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	GILBERT	. 2	0	0		0.	63,000	16,136	79,13

KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3 (OC-12 O	C-48	PATH	EQPT	TOTAL
•							COST	COST	COST
370 M	to the state of th	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
371 ME		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
372 M		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
373 M		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
the second secon	IOENIX	4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
375 ME		4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
376 M	A Company of the Comp	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
377 TE		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
378 ME	ESA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
379		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
380 ME	ESA	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
381		1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
382 ME	EŚA	4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
383		1	0	0	0	o o	63,000	5,468	68,46
384 M	ESA	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
385 ME	ESA	1	Ö	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
386 ME	ESA	1	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
387 M	ESA	3	0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
388 TE	MPE	3	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
389 GI	LBERT	4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
390 PH	IOENIX	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
391 TE		8		0	0	0	63,000	16,136	79,13
	LBERT	2	0	0	0		63,000	5,468	79,13 68,46
393 TE		2	0	0		0	63,000	5,468	
394 TE		5 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2	0	0	0	63,000	A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	68,46
	LBERT	1	<u>-</u>	0	0	0	63,000	48,696	111,69
	LBERT	4	0	0	0	0_	63,000	5,468	68,46
397 TE	And the second s	2	0			0		5,468	68,46
Commence of the same of the sa	LBERT	<u>-</u> -	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
399 TE			O	0	0		63,000	5,468	68,46
400 TE	and the second second second	······································					63,000	16,136	79,13
	LBERT		0	0	,	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	LBERT		0	0	and the second second	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
	LBERT	1	0	. 0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
and the second second		3	. 0	. 0	. 0.	0_	63,000	5,468	68,46
e e e	LBERT	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
405 TE		3	0	0_	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
406 TE		4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
407 TE			0		0	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
408 TE		2	0	. 0	0_	0	63,000	5,468	68,46
and the second second	LBERT	4	0	0	0	0	63,000	8,068	71,06
410 GI	LBERT	1	2	0	0	0	63,000	47,958	110,95

CITY CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3	OC-12 OC-48	PATH COST	EQPT	TOTAL
ere				• • • • • • • •		COST	COST
411 MESA	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
412 MESA	4	0	0	0 0	63,000	8,068	71,068
413 MESA	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
414 MESA	4	0	0	0 0	63,000	8,068	71,068
415 GILBERT	4	0	0	0 0	63,000	8,068	71,068
416 PHOENIX	9	0	0	_ OO	63,000	24,204	87,204
417 TEMPE	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
418 PHOENIX	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
419 TEMPE	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
420 TEMPE	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
421 GILBERT	3	0		0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
422 CHANDLER	2	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
423 CHANDLER	25	1	0	0 0	63,000	49,686	112,686
424 CHANDLER	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
425 PHOENIX	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	
426 CHANDLER	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
427 CHANDLER	1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	. 0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
428 CHANDLER	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	the state of the second section is	68,468
429 CHANDLER	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
430 PHOENIX	1	O		0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
431 PHOENIX	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
432 CHANDLER	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
433 CHANDLER	2	0	0	0 0	A COLOR OF A CAMPAGE AND A CONTRACT OF A COLOR OF A CAMPAGE AND A CAMPAG	5,468	68,468
434 CHANDLER	1	0	0		63,000	5,468	68,468
435 PHOENIX	·		0		63,000	5,468	68,468
436 CHANDLER				00	63,000	5,468	68,468
437 CHANDLER	21	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
438 CHANDLER	41	1	0	The second of the second	63,000	48,948	111,948
439 CHANDLER		0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
440 CHANDLER	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
to the second the property of the experimental and the second second second	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0		0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
441 CHANDLER	2	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
442 CHANDLER		0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
443 CHANDLER		0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
444 CHANDLER	1		0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
445 CHANDLER	3	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
446 CHANDLER	. 24	1	0	0 0	63,000	48,948	111,948
447 CHANDLER	1.	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
448 CHANDLER	3	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
449 CHANDLER	3	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
450 CHANDLER	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468
451 CHANDLER	1	0	0	0 0	63,000	5,468	68,468

KEY	CITY	DS1	DS3	OC-3	OC-12 O	C-48	PATH COST	EQPT COST	TOTAL COST
452 C	HANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
453 C	HANDLER	2	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
454 C	HANDLER	1	0	0	0	0	63,000	5,468	68,468
	Sub-Totals				Totals		\$28,602,000	\$3,689,231	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
. =	# in this Study 3101 Sum of Total Cos						Total Cost	\$32,291,231	
	# in th	is Band	454				Average of	Total Cost	\$71,126
•	•			. · · •	·· ·· ·•	% 0	f Addresses i	n this Band	14.64%

PROFILE POWER ENGINEERS, INC.

PROFILE

POWER ENGINEERS, INC.

POWER Engineers, Inc. (POWER) is a consulting engineering firm headquartered in Idaho with offices located throughout the United States and overseas. Since its beginning 20 years ago, POWER has grown from a staff of three to a firm which now employs over 400. Through growth and diversification, POWER has become a multidisciplinary consulting firm specializing in many technical areas. POWER's full-service capabilities provide integrated services from preliminary planning stages through construction and close-out. Its professional staff includes engineers in the following disciplines:

- Project Management
- Communications
- GIS / GPS
- Mechanical
- Electrical
- Geotechnical
- Controls
- Combustion
- SCADA

- Structural / Architectural
- Civil
- Chemical
- Petroleum
- Mining
- Environmental
- Thermography
- Training Development / Delivery

Staff and/or field office locations include:

- Phoenix, AZ
- Denver, CO
- Atlanta, GA
- Boise, ID
- Hailey, ID
- St. Louis, MO
- Mindanao, The Philippines
- Portland, OR
- Austin, TX

POWER has been recognized as one of the top ten engineering consulting firms in the country by trade publications, i.e., "Consulting - Specifying Engineer", etc.

45-260 (06/01/98)lcs

POWER Engineers, Inc.

ICS DIVISION

LINES OF BUSINESS

- TELEPHONY
 - Traditional Outside Plant Planning & Design (Copper, Fiber, SLE, etc.)
 - Data Base Administration
 - Records Management
- BROADBAND PLANNING & DESIGN
 - Video & Data Transport Systems
 - Energy Management Systems (Distribution & Substation)
- RF / CELLULAR / PCS
 - Design
 - Site Acquisition
- * SYSTEMS DESIGN
 - Inside Plant Design & Engineering
 - LAN/WAN Networks
 - SONET
- " GIS / GPS SERVICES
 - Conversion
 - Analysis
 - Application Development
- TRAINING DEVELOPMENT & DELIVERY
 - Instructional Design (Job Studies, Needs Assessment, etc.)
 - Interactive Multimedia
 - Computer Based Training (CBT)
 - Electronic Support Systems
 - OSP Engineering Training (Instructors)
 - Construction / 1 & M Training (Instructors)
- ETC.

POWER Engineers, Inc.

ICS DIVISION

REPRESENTATIVE CLIENT LIST

- AT&T
- CENTRAL & SOUTH WEST UTILITIES
- CITIZENS TELEPHONE (& UTILITY)
- COX COMMUNICATIONS
- CUSTER TELEPHONE (INDEPENDENT)
- FIBERLINK
- JONES LIGHTWAVE
- LUCENT TECHNOLOGIES
- MCI
- MICRON
- R & L ELECTRONICS
- TCI
- U S GOVERNMENT (GEOLOGICAL SURVEY)
- U S SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS CO.
- U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS

QUALIFICATIONS OF POWER ENGINEERS, INC.

POWER Engineers, Inc. is a company qualified to complete engineering, and related, work in the communications environment. The communications engineering division is also supported with expertise in all the professional engineering disciplines and a complete, state of the art GIS operation.

The following pages describe POWER in terms of a brief profile, communications lines of business, and a representative client list.

Affidavit

BE IT KNOWN, that <u>Nickie</u>	L. R. Duff, the Undersigned, being of
	under oath as outlined in the attached document,
entitled, "Phoenix Cost Study and	! Model" which is annexed and incorporated
herein:	
WITNESS my hand under the penalties	of perjury this 13th day of August, 1998.
Signed A. R.C.	
Signed	Signed
Signed	Signed
Before me this day personally appeared described in and who executed this agree	Nickie L. R. Duff, known to me to be the person element.
WITNESS my hand and official seal at State of <u>Idaho</u> this <u>13+</u>	Boise in Ada County in the day of Dugust, 1998.
Signature Sandrum. Solu	ica
Notary Public for Idahe	
My commission expires $3/7/200$	<u>C</u>



ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF HIGH CAPACITY COMPETITION IN PHOENIX

Alfred E. Kahn and Timothy J. Tardiff

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

U S WEST Communications is requesting, under Section 10 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, that the Federal Communications Commission forebear from regulating it as a dominant carrier in its sale of high capacity services in the Phoenix metropolitan area. In support of its Petition the Company has asked us to assess its market power in the offer of these services in that area. In performing this analysis, we rely on information about that market obtained from studies performed by others (Quality Strategies and POWER Engineers), on data provided by the Company, and on our own primary and secondary research on this and related markets.

Following the approach the FCC has previously used to assess market power for other services, we conclude that the market for high capacity services in the Phoenix area fully exhibits the indicia of competition that the Commission has prescribed. In particular, (1) U S WEST has a diminishing market share—indeed, it serves only 30 percent of the retail market—and is barely providing one-half of the facilities that serve new demand; (2) customers are highly sensitive to price and other service characteristics; (3) U S WEST's competitors have the ability to expand their capacity sufficiently to take over a major share of the market currently served by U S WEST and there are minimal barriers to entry; and (4) U S WEST's size does not confer on it an insurmountable competitive advantage.

U S WEST's lack of market power signifies that competition itself, without dominant firm regulation, is sufficient to limit its ability to impose anticompetitive prices and other conditions of service. In light of these developments, the costs of maintaining dominant firm regulation in this market clearly exceed whatever benefits continued regulation could possibly confer.

I. Introduction

U S WEST Communications is requesting, under Section 10 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, that the Federal Communications Commission forebear from regulating it as a dominant carrier in its sale of high capacity services in the Phoenix metropolitan area. In seeking nondominant status for these services, the Company argues that competitive entry, along with the competition to which it is already subject, is sufficient to constrain its ability to charge prices above competitive levels and, therefore, the costs of continued dominant carrier regulation far outweigh the benefits.

U S WEST has asked us to assess its market power in the offer of these services in Phoenix. In performing this analysis, we rely on information about that market obtained from studies performed by others (Quality Strategies and POWER Engineers), on data provided by the Company, and our own primary and secondary research on this and related markets. We follow the framework the FCC has used in determining nondominant status in other situations. We conclude that competition in this particular market is sufficiently strong to constrain U S

WEST's ability to control prices and other terms and conditions of service, and that continuing dominant-firm regulation of its high capacity services would be anti-competitive and injurious to consumers.

II. THE FCC'S APPROACH TO MARKET POWER ASSESSMENT

The FCC employs standard economic concepts in its assessment of a firm's market power.² It first defines the relevant product and geographic market, taking into account both demand and supply substitution. It then determines whether a firm currently regulated as a dominant carrier still possesses monopoly power within that market, by examining four specific measures:³ (1) market share, (2) demand elasticity, (3) supply elasticity and (4) the cost structure, size and resources of the putatively dominant firm. We proceed to analyze each of these in turn.

A. Market Definition

Services provided to customers with usage sufficiently great to be economically served with high capacity facilities⁴ define the relevant product market.⁵ These customers would be

See, for example, Motion of AT&T Corp. to be Reclassified as a Non-Dominant Carrier, October 12, 1995 ("AT&T nondominance order") and Policies and Rules for Alternative Incentive Based Regulation of Comsat Corporation, IB Docket No. 98-60, April 24, 1998.

² Cf., e.g., the methods employed by the antitrust agencies for defining markets when analyzing proposed mergers. Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission, *Horizontal Merger Guidelines*, April 2, 1992.

³ These measures are similar to those described in W.M. Landes and R.A. Posner, "Market Power in Antitrust Cases," *Harvard Law Review*, 1981.

⁴ These include DS-1 or higher capacity facilities.